

With 8? (note) complimentary 2081

September 1895.

AM.

DISCUSSION :

"On the Contact of European
and Native Civilizations,"

HELD AT THE MEETING OF

The British Association,
IPSWICH,

1895.

WRITERS AND SPEAKERS :

Prof. W. M. FLINDERS PETRIE, D.C.L.,	
LORD STANMORE,	Mr. E. F. IM-THURN,
Prof. A. C. HADDON, M.A.,	Mr. DARNELL DAVIS,
Dr. CUST,	Mr. H. LING-ROTH,
Dr. H. O. FORBES,	Mr. RAYNBIRD.

PRICE SIXPENCE.

DISCUSSION :

"On the Contact of European
and Native Civilizations,"

HELD AT THE MEETING OF

The British Association,

IPSWICH,

1895.

WRITERS AND SPEAKERS :

Prof. W. M. FLINDERS PETRIE, D.C.L.,	
LORD STANMORE,	Mr. E. F. IM-THURN,
Prof. A. C. HADDON, M.A.,	Mr. DARNELL DAVIS,
Dr. CUST,	Mr. H. LING-ROTH,
Dr. H. O. FORBES,	Mr. RAYNBIRD.

PRICE SIXPENCE.

ON THE CONTACT OF EUROPEAN AND NATIVE CIVILIZATIONS.

The subject was opened in the following passages of the Presidential Address by Prof. W. M. FLINDERS PETRIE.

Besides the theoretical and scientific side of anthropology there is also a very practical side to it which has not received any sufficient development as yet. Anthropology should in our nation be studied first and foremost as the art of dealing with other races. I cannot do better than quote a remark from the address of our previous President, General Pitt Rivers, a remark which has been waiting twenty-three years for further notice. He said, "Nor is it unimportant to remember that anthropology has its practical and humanitarian aspect; and that as our race is more often brought into contact with savages than any other, a knowledge of their habits and modes of thought may be of the utmost value to us in utilising their labour, as well as in checking those inhuman practices from which they have but too often suffered at our hands."

The foremost principle which should be always in view is that the civilisation of any race is not a system which can be changed at will. Every civilisation is the growing product of a very complex set of conditions, depending on race and character, on climate, on trade, and every minutæ of the circumstances. To attempt to alter such a system apart from its conditions is impossible. For instance, whenever a total change is made in government, it breaks down altogether, and a resort to the despotism of one man is the result. When the English Constitution was swept away, Cromwell or anarchy was the alternative: when the French Constitution was swept away, Napoleon was the only salvation from anarchy. And

if this is the case when the externals of government alone are altered, how much more is it the case if we attempt to uproot the whole of a civilisation and social life? We may despotically force a bald and senseless imitation of our ways on another people, but we shall only destroy their life without implanting any vitality in its place. No change is legitimate or beneficial to the real character of a people except what flows from conviction and the natural growth of the mind. And if the imposition of a foreign system is injurious, how miserable is the forcing of a system such as ours, which is the most complex, unnatural, and artificial that has been known; a system developed in a cold country, amid one of the hardest, least sympathetic, and most self-denying and calculating of all peoples of the world. Such a system, the product of such extreme conditions, we attempt to force on the least developed races, and expect from them an implicit subservience to our illogical law and our inconsistent morality. The result is death; we make a dead-house and call it civilisation. Scarcely a single race can bear the contact and the burden. And then we talk complacently about the mysterious decay of savages before white men.

Yet some people believe that a handful of men who have been mutilated into conformity with civilised ideals are better worth having than a race of sturdy independent beings. Let us hear what becomes of the unhappy products of our notions. On the Andaman Islands an orphanage, or training school, was started, and more than forty children were reclaimed from savagery, or torn from a healthy and vigorous life. These were the results. "Of all the girls two only have continued in the Settlement, the other survivors having long since resumed the customs of their jungle homes. . . . Physically speaking, training has a deteriorating effect, for of all the children who have passed through the orphanage, probably not more than ten are alive at the present time, while of those that have been married, two or three only have become parents, and of their children not one has been reared." Such is the result of our attempts on a race of low but perfect civilisation, whom we eradicate in trying to improve them.

Let us turn now to our attempts on a higher race, the degenerated and Arabised descendants of a great people, the Egyptians. Here there is much ability to work on, and also a good standard of comfort and morality, conformable to our notions. Yet the planting of another civilisation is scarcely to be borne by them. The Europeanised Egyptian is in most cases the mere blotting paper of civilisation, absorbing what is most superficial and undesirable. The overlaying

of a French or English layer on a native mind produces only a hybrid intellect, from which no natural growth or fertility can be expected. Far the more promising intellects are those trained by intelligent native teachers, where as much as can be safely assimilated has grown naturally as a development of the native mind.

Yet some will say why not plant all we can? what can be the harm of raising the intellect in some cases if we cannot do it in all? The harm is that you manufacture idiots. Some of the peasantry are taught to read and write, and the result of this burden which their fathers bore not is that they become fools. I cannot say this too plainly: an Egyptian peasant who has had reading and writing thrust on him is, in every case that I have met with, half-witted, silly, or incapable of taking care of himself. His intellect and his health have been undermined and crippled by the forcing of education. With the Copt this is quite different: his fathers have been scribes for thousands of years, and his capacity is far greater, so that he can receive much more without deterioration. Observation of these people leads to the view that the average man cannot receive much more knowledge than his immediate ancestors. Perhaps a quarter or a tenth more of ideas can be safely put into each generation without deterioration of mind or body; but, at the best, growth of the mind can in the average man be but by fractional increments in each generation, and any large increase will surely be deleterious to the average mind, always remembering that there are exceptions both higher and lower. Such a result is only what is to be expected when we consider that the brain is the part of man which develops and changes as races reach a higher level, while the body remains practically constant through ages. To expect the brain to make sudden changes of ability would be as reasonable as to expect a cart-horse to breed racers, or a greyhound to tend sheep. Man mainly develops by internal differences in his brain structure, as other animals develop by external differences in bones and muscles.

What, then, it may be asked, can be done to elevate other races? How can we benefit them? Most certainly not by Europeanising them. By real education, leading out the mind to a natural and solid growth, much can be done; but not by enforcing a mass of accomplishments and artificialities of life. The general impression in England is that reading, writing, and arithmetic are the elements of education. They might be so to us, 'in the foremost files of time,' but they assuredly are not so to other races. The complex ideas of connecting forms and sounds is far

too great a step for many brains; and when we succeed, to our delight, in turning out finished readers, Nature comes in with the stern reply, 'Of their children not one has been reared.' Our bigoted belief in reading and writing is not in the least justified when we look at the mass of mankind. The exquisite art and noble architecture of Mykenæ, the undying song of Homer, the extensive trade of the Bronze Age, all belonged to people who never read or wrote. At this day some of my best friends—in Egypt—are happily ignorant of such accomplishments, and assuredly I never encourage them to any such useless waste of their brains. The great essentials of a valuable character—moderation, justice, sympathy, politeness and consideration, quick observation, shrewdness, ability to plan and pre-arrange, a keen sense of the uses and properties of things—all these are the qualities on which I value my Egyptian friends, and such qualities are what should be evolved by any education worth the name. No brain, however humble, will be the worse for such education which is hourly in use; while in the practical life of a simple community the accomplishments of reading and writing are not needed for perhaps a week or a month at a time. The keenest interest is taken by some races, and probably by all, in geography, modes of government, and social systems; and in most countries elements of hygiene and improvements in the dwellings and arts of life may be taught with the best results. There is therefore a very wide field for the education of even the lowest races, without throwing any great strain on the mental powers. And it must always be remembered that memory is far more perfect where a less burden of learning is thrown on the mind, and ideas and facts can be remembered and brought into use more readily by minds unstrained by artificial instruction.

The greatest educational influence, however, is example. This is obvious when we see how rapidly the curses of our civilisation spread among those unhappily subjected to it. The contact of Europeans with lower races is almost always a detriment, and it is the severest reflection on ourselves that such should be the case. It is a subject which has given much room for thought in my own dealings with the Egyptian peasant to consider how this deleterious effect is produced, and how it is to be avoided. Firstly, it is due to carelessness in leaving temptations open to natives, which may be no temptations to ourselves. To be careless about sixpences is as demoralising to them as a man who tossed sovereigns about the street would be to us. Examples of carelessness in this point are among the worst of influences. Another injury is the inducement to natives to imitate the ways and

customs of Europeans without reason. Every imitation, as mere imitation, is a direct injury to character; it teaches a man to trust to some one else instead of thinking for himself; it induces a belief in externals constituting our superiority, while foresight and self-restraint are the real roots of it; and it destroys all chance of any real and solid growth of character which can flourish independently. A native should always be discouraged from any imitation, unless he attempts it as an intelligent improvement on his own habits. Another sadly common evil is the abuse of power, which lowers that sense of self-respect, of honour, and of honesty which can be found in most races. If a man or a government defrauds, it is but natural to the sufferer to try and recompense himself by any means available; and thus an interminable system of reprisals is set up. Such is the chronic state of the East at present among the more civilised races. The Egyptians are notorious for their avarice, and are usually credited with being inveterate money-grabbers; yet no sooner do they find that this system of reprisals is abandoned and strict justice maintained, than they at once respond to it; and I may say that when confidence has once been gained it is almost as common to find a man dispute an account against his own interest as for himself, and scarcely ever is any attempt made at false statements or impositions. Such is the healthy response to straightforward dealing with them.

It is therefore in encouraging a healthy growth of all that is worthy and good in the existing systems of lower civilisation, in repressing all mere imitations and senseless copying, and in proceeding on a rigorously just, yet genial, course of conduct, that the safe and true line lies for intercourse with inferior or different civilisations.

The PRESIDENT, in opening the discussion on the "Relation of Our Civilisation to that of Other Races," said:—It may be as well to say a few words for the avoidance of misunderstandings. In what I have already said in my opening address I expressly summed up this question of non-interference as resulting in the conclusion that we should encourage a healthy growth of all that is worthy and good in the existing systems to begin with. I know that the toleration of anything outside of their own shibboleths is hateful to some people; but I make bold to agree with Paul of Tarsus that in every nation there are men who seek after righteousness—(hear, hear)—that elements of good exist in all races, and that our duty is to select and encourage desirable elements, but never to im-

pose any ideals which are peculiar to our own race, age, or civilisation. I know that it is often said that only by clearing away all that is associated with error can we begin to lay out a plan according to our notions. In this, again, I prefer to differ along with that gentleman of Tarsus, who preached the non-interference with any customs—even with idol offerings—provided they did not belie the real belief of the man in the sight of those around him. That same eminently practical authority did not see if needful, any more than that prince of common sense Epictetus, to prohibit slavery, polygamy, or even gladiatorial shows. An appeal to the existing conscience of mankind, a clear statement of practical moral principles, and, leaving the application of them to the rational growth of the conscience, is thus laid down for us as a precedent in the greatest readjustment of the moral sense that the world has ever seen. Such a precedent is good, because it has proved successful, and such may well be our guide in dealing with native customs, with rules of conduct, and with the details of dress and habits. Let changes flow from reflection and conviction, and then you have reformed a man, and not manufactured an automaton. The classes who come in contact with other races are five—the traveller, the religious teacher, the trader, the official and the settler. Everyone of these classes may do great good or great harm; in every class there are both judicious and injudicious men. We are not here to-day to consider the special action of any one of those classes, but only to discuss the general principles on which their conduct and toleration should rest; and some of those classes command our respect for their motives, however we may not admire in all cases their judgment. With the details of the work we have nothing to do. I could quote most pointed illustrations of folly from the deeds of every one of those classes, and therefore we should not consider them separately, but rather the methods which are common to all of them. Whether it be the governor, or anyone below him, who imposes an absurd dress, or prohibits a harmless custom, the action and not the actor is what we are now about to consider. I therefore appeal to those who may now speak to strictly avoid obscuring the business by referring to any personal questions, and to treat the various details of life on their own merits regardless of the prejudices which belong to us. (Hear, hear.)

The PRESIDENT said he much regretted that Lord Stanmore was unable to be present. He had, however, been good enough to provide them with a paper. (Hear, hear.) The opinions of Lord Stanmore, who was more generally known as Sir Arthur Gordon, were entitled to the highest consideration. (Hear, Hear.)

The President then read Lord STANMORE'S paper, as follows:—The mode in which subject races have been dealt with by alien rulers has varied in every age, and in almost every place; but nearly all these varieties of treatment have been, in fact, governed by one or other of three principles of action, which may be expressed as follows:—1. That the interests of the ruling race are alone to be considered, and the subject race either cleared out of the way, or made servile instruments of their rulers' profit or pleasure. 2. That natives are entitled to justice and consideration, but that their interests must be set aside if they conflict with those of white men. 3. That the interests of whites and natives alike are to receive equal consideration, and are entitled to equal protection. The doctrine that a superior race may rightfully oppress, and utilise for its own benefit, the existence of a subject one, has been in former days very general, and is at the present day not only very far more widely spread than it ought to be, but far more so than is, perhaps, commonly suspected. Those who have watched most closely the contact of white men with savages or imperfectly civilised races, will be the first to recognise and admit that this is the case. But it is not a principle of policy which any civilised Government of the present day would dare to avow, or on which, we may hope, it would venture to act in spite of formal disavowal. The acknowledgment (though perhaps but a grudging acknowledgment) that strict justice should be shown by the dominant race to the inferior, is, of course, to be welcomed, even when combined, as it so often is, with a jealousy ever on the watch not to extend that justice one hair's breadth beyond the narrowest limits within which it can be restrained, and to take every opportunity, which can without manifest bad faith be taken, of improving the position of the conqueror at the expense of the conquered. But the recognition of the interests of all classes of the population as equal objects of solicitude is a higher and a nobler principle of action, and it is with this alone that we are really concerned. For when we are asked to consider the best mode of dealing with native races, it is clearly with a view to their preservation and improvement.

But, even when these objects are most desired, the really benevolent intentions of rulers are often frustrated. The most enlightened views and the most liberal legislation can be neutralised by the social aversion between discordant races, which may accompany a full recognition of their political and social rights, but which renders their practical exercise impossible. Even where no such conscious repulsion exists, there is not unfrequently a want of imagination on the part of the dominant race, which prevents any perception of questions from a native point of view, and produces a lack of tolerance for laws or usages not in accordance with European modes of thought—a want of perception which is often not only as injurious as real injustice, but frequently leads up to it. Indeed, it is probable that as much real wrong has been inflicted by the conscientious but narrow-minded desire, to act in accordance with maxims in themselves generally sound, but not of universal application, as by violence and tyranny.

Where the governing power has not itself shaken off such prejudices, it is probable that the harm done by it will be in almost exact proportion to the degree of activity with which it strives to effect good. Under the influence of a desire to effect improvements, a pressure is put upon the native to adopt European habits, perhaps unsuitable, and almost certainly distasteful to him. He is subjected to laws which are strange to him, and which, in some respects, conflict with his own ideas of justice. He is placed on a nominal footing of equality before the law with his white fellow subjects, but he knows that the advantage in any contest under such laws is all on the side of those who have long been familiar with their operation. He is urged to simulate ideas which are unintelligible to him. Impatience at the levity and ignorance, if not misconduct, too often displayed by natives in positions of authority, may lead to their services being set aside, and all native agency replaced by that of white officials and magistrates. Something—perhaps much, perhaps little—is done for the native; nothing is left to be done by him, or in his own way. Such a mode of treatment I hold to be not only rash and unwise, but where a native population greatly outnumbers the white element, to be also attended with no inconsiderable danger. Even where the settlers are too strong to be resisted with success there will be danger of collisions, whilst, at best, even if there be no collision, the natives, bewildered and depressed, deprived of all interest and object in life, sink into indolence, apathy, and vice. They have no strength to resist the temptations and snares innumerable to which they are exposed almost without safeguard. They lose position, property, self respect, and health, and perish from off the face of the earth.

It is manifest that the more the native polity is retained, native agency employed, and the changes left until they are spontaneously called for the less likely are these results to follow. But it is not enough to abstain from seeking hastily to replace native institutions by unreal imitations of European models. The moral sense of a semi-civilised race is often very unlike our own, but is not on that account the less real; and it would be a great mistake to suppose that it does not exercise a most powerful influence upon thought and action. A native may suffer very patiently what we should deem a grievous wrong, because to him it may not present the same intolerable appearance: but if rights really cherished by him be touched, if his moral sense be shocked, or his honour seriously wounded, it may be doubted whether he will ever again entertain any belief in the justice of those who have, as he conceives, wronged him, respect those who have shown what seems to him moral weaknesses, or forgive the insult he has received. Severity he can pardon, and even, perhaps, admire. Some things which an European could not forgive—blows for instance, or an imputation of falsehood—he may take with indifference, and easily condone; but there are offences which are indelible, and wherever men of white and native races meet, such offences are sure to be committed, partly in careless indifference, and as frequently through well-meant blundering.

It is, therefore, of the utmost importance to seize, if possible, the spirit in which native institutions have been framed, and endeavour to work them as to develop to the utmost possible extent the latent capacities of the people for the management of their own affairs, without exciting their suspicion, or destroying their self-respect. Of course, the application of these principles must vary greatly according to the capacities and condition of the people with whom we are called on to deal. No one would dream of placing on one level the acute and cultivated Hindoo or Singhalese and the wandering and naked savage of the Australian Bush, or the fierce marauding tribes of Central Africa. But in all the varying conditions of the problem, the maxim that native races are best governed through the agency of natives, and in accordance with their own ideas and traditions, will remain a sound one, and of almost universal application. If moral considerations be left out of sight, I am by no means sure that the plan pursued by the Russians in Central Asia is not, in the long run, the best so far as the interests of both races are concerned. That plan consists in striking, in the first instance, a crushing and even cruel blow, and then afterwards conducting administration almost wholly through native agency. The recollection of the severity employed inspires a

fear and respect which does not wear off until a habit of loyal service has been established, and the good-will and self-interest of the leaders of the native race have been conciliated by the possibilities of employment afforded them. Such good-will, it may be said, would be equally conciliated by their employment in the manner contemplated, even without the previous severity. This is in some degree true, but where there has not been a stern and sharp lesson of the danger attending resistance to the stranger's rule, there is always danger of the powers conferred on natives being used to undermine the dominion which they nominally serve. On the whole, therefore, I think it not unfortunate for the interests of the natives themselves, when a legitimate occasion arises, early in the day, to justify the exercise of severity. It makes easy, indulgence which might not otherwise prove safe, and renders possible the employment of natives in positions of trust to a far greater degree than would otherwise be practicable. But, of course, it would be indefensible to provoke such an occasion, or even to lead up to it, although I fear that on some occasions, and in some places (I am speaking of the contact between native races and white men generally, not of that between natives and Englishmen only), such measures have been resorted to. But in any case and all circumstances, the employment of natives in offices of trust, and the conduct of affairs on lines intelligible to native thought to the furthest degree that safety will permit, is manifestly desirable. That which is done by natives themselves and in their own way, however clumsily done, is of infinitely more value than a great deal done for them without their own participation; whilst the advantage of associating influential natives with the action of government, and with any temporary unpopularity which such action may cause, can hardly be too highly estimated. The more nearly native races are governed on lines resembling a protectorate, rather than a direct rule, the more successful is the experiment likely to be in all that concerns the preservation of the race itself, and its contented acquiescence in a substantially alien rule.

In every case, however, certain specific questions are sure to arise, and much difference of opinion may exist as to their solution. Of these, perhaps, the first is in what manner and to what extent taxation is most equitably imposed on uncivilised races, and most easily borne by them. Practically, there are but three modes of taxing savages: By a hearth tax or poll tax; by the performance of gratuitous services; or by contributions of produce. Of these, the first, though not uncommonly adopted, is open to many and grave objections. It affords great facilities for corruption. Its literal equality practically renders its incidence in the highest degree unequal. It is liable

to serious abuse, and has often been used as an instrument for forcing men into involuntary servitude. Above all, its individuality is repugnant to the ideas of the native. Among races in the earlier stages of civilisation, the individual almost always acts as part of a family or village, and the traditional feeling of centuries in this respect will only slowly change under the influence of altered times and manners. The fact must be accepted, deal with it as we may. But if this mode of taxation be set aside, all that remains is the alternative of contributions of produce, or the performance of gratuitous labour. Either of these systems is in accordance with the habits and usages of a semi-civilised people, and the preference of the one or the other will probably depend on local circumstances. Where there is much labour on public works to be done, or where roads are being made all over the country, so that practically the whole population can be employed at no great distance from their homes, probably the latter will be found most advantageous; where this is not the case, the plan of taxation in produce will be adopted. The late Earl Grey, who had thoroughly mastered this question, and who was quite aware that among semi-civilised people "taxation may be more easily and justly levied in the shape of a tribute from the tribe than in that of taxes due from individuals," wrote in one of his despatches that a produce-tax was that "which, in any early stage of civilisation when money is scarce, and when little capital has been invested in land, seems to be the least burdensome that can be had recourse to, though in a more advanced state of society it is the reverse." In the truth of Lord Grey's remark, I, for one, entirely concur. It will generally be found that except in countries which have already made some advance in civilisation, the number of public works on which unskilled labour can be profitably employed is but small, and that a more equitable apportionment of taxation will accompany the receipt of a revenue from produce. But I do not by any means advocate the payment of a mass of miscellaneous articles to the government, to be disposed as may best be devised. I venture to think that a system borrowed to some extent from that which until lately prevailed in Java is, with a few but important changes, about the best which could be devised. Under this system, certain communal lands in every province, district, and village, have to be cultivated in certain fixed products, the whole of which are handed over to government, and by it to a contractor whose tender has been accepted for the year for the purchase of such produce from government. Of the price paid the government retains the amount of the tax at which each province has been assessed in money, and the remainder of the price is returned to the cultivators.

This, though an imitation of the Java system, is in its most important feature its exact reverse. In Java, a certain fixed price was given to the cultivator, and the whole of the profits above that amount returned by the government. The plan to which I refer provides that the government should retain the amount of its assessed tax, and that the whole of the profits above that amount should go to the cultivator, which to him is a much more advantageous arrangement.

Wherever natives and whites meet, the question of the native rights in land, and their power of alienating it, is sure to give rise to much dissension, and there are few matters in regard to which native races have, in all ages, been more unscrupulously or unjustly treated. The question is one of the highest importance, and of the greatest difficulty. Strictly speaking, I believe it to be very rarely the case that any power of alienation whatever rests either in the chiefs of a tribe, or even of the tribe collectively, and the mistakes and quarrels which have arisen over land sales are in a great measure due to the tacit assumption by white men that land is possessed by savages with all the incidents of European legal tenure. No mistake could well have less foundation. Land in savage and semi-civilised communities, as a general rule, belongs to the whole family or tribe, and to each member of it, past, present, or future, to the old, the young, and the unborn, in strict entail. When a native "sells" he usually thinks he merely admits the buyer to the same common rights which he himself enjoys. At most he thinks he has alienated in his own right in favour of the stranger, but the thought that the tribe or family has excluded itself from all future interest in the land is hardly ever comprehended by him, if ever. Still, the alienation of land to whites cannot, of course, be wholly prohibited, and probably the safest course to adopt is that which is, I believe, usually pursued, that namely of forbidding all sales except through the agency of the government. But then everything will depend upon the spirit in which and government discharges its functions. To foster and promote by every means the rapid transfer of the soil from native to white hands is not to protect the native, or regard his interests. The price paid even if adequate is soon dissipated, and the native who is cut off from all connection with land becomes but too generally an outcast and a serf. Another matter which requires constant vigilance, if native interests are to be preserved, is the necessity for placing a limit on their indebtedness. They should not be permitted ignorantly to squander their own substance. The protection which the law accords to minors should, at all events in a great degree, be extended to natives also. Where this is not done, the whole property of a native community is at the mercy

of any man who will minister to their passing wants and whims, whilst individuals are often made the very bond slaves of some unprincipled trader by the advance of a few pounds, or it may be even a few shillings. I have known a system pursued where no debt incurred by a native was recoverable before a court unless it had been incurred with the approval of the local authorities. It worked well, and something of the kind is essential if the native is to be kept out of the clutches of the obliging friends who are always willing to give him goods on credit, or advance money in small sums, to be repaid when convenient.

That ardent spirits should be rigidly proscribed, and the access to them by natives in a savage state efficiently prevented, is an axiom universally admitted, and no hankering after revenue, nor any nonsense as to the privileges of a British subject, should be allowed to interfere with its observance. But, of course, the strict enforcement of such a rule must be somewhat relaxed in the case of native communities further advanced in civilisation, and where natives of importance have been accustomed freely to use spirituous liquors, and the sudden withdrawal of a privilege they have long enjoyed might diminish their prestige and influence, I would allow them to continue to use them, subject to the liability of this permission, if abused, being withdrawn at any time by order of the government. As to the use of arms, I do not feel so strongly as many other men do. What should be done in this respect depends, I think, almost wholly on the condition of the particular locality. Where tribal, racial, or religious wars either still exist, or may be easily revived, their use should be forbidden, but where no such danger exists I should not be disposed to insist on the prohibition. In some localities arms are really wanted as a protection against wild beasts, or in the pursuit of game; while there is no more fruitful source of blackmail. A policeman may with almost certain impunity demand a bribe either to wink at the illicit possession of arms, or to avert a false charge of possessing them.

Every head on which I have thus shortly touched requires pages of illustration and explanation to render them fully intelligible, nor have I left myself any space to enter upon the numerous and grave questions connected with the attitude to be assumed towards the social customs and peculiar habits of the natives of any country. Of course certain customs, such as cannibalism, infanticide, and wholesale plunder of their inferiors by local chiefs, must be put an end to at once and firmly. But it will be well to permit the continuance of many customs repugnant and even repulsive to European ideas. Polygamy

should not, I think, be legally forbidden; caste distinctions, and the marks of deference usual towards those of higher native rank, though not recognised by law, should not, in my opinion, be discouraged, or roughly disregarded. Time will do its own work in such matters, and to it alone I would trust for alterations, where alteration is desirable. I have reached my limit, and feel even more acutely than I did when I commenced this paper, how impossible it is in a few minutes to deal with even a small number of the points raised by the question, "What is the best mode of dealing with native races." But I cannot conclude without saying that what is above all things necessary in the successful treatment of native races is sympathy on the part of those of our own race who come in contact with them—not sympathy of the sentimental sort, which, as I have often seen, is quite compatible with much annoyance and offensive patronage, but that sympathy of fellow feeling, which at once places one man on an easy and equal footing with another. This is very quickly perceived by almost all native races, and when perceived is always thoroughly appreciated.

Professor HADDON said civilization did not consist of railways, telegraphs, representative government, nor even of those characteristic British exports—beer and Bible—(laughter)—but of right living and the cultivation of morality. The British people especially desired to crush other peoples into their own procrustean bed of belief and action. While acknowledging that war had been a powerful, and probably a necessary, factor in the evolution of human communities, they were justified, forcibly, if necessary, in putting a stop to inter-tribal wars, but as long as they waged wars on their own account they could not take the high moral ground. Till they ceased to attack others they could only say that it was not expedient for their subject tribes to quarrel. There were many good people who confused clothing with morality. The experience of travellers was that there was absolutely no relation between the amount of clothing and the degree of virtue. If they wanted to extend the market for their cotton goods, let them do so honestly, and not under the pretence of religion or morality. There appeared to be good evidence to show that the adoption of European clothing often brought grave evils in its train. The dissemination of tobacco had no moral justification; they made a profit out of it; it was a convenient form of barter, and was valuable, as it was a trade article, but soon vanished in smoke. No Government should sanc-

tion the introduction or sale of spirits or pernicious stimulants or sedatives. Where a particular form of government has developed we can trace its characteristics as having slowly evolved from an antecedent family life, and this in its turn is dependent upon the mode of life, and that on the environment. Place determines work, and the nature of the work shapes the family organisation, and from this springs government. For example, the feudal system and the clan system of Europe were different, not because of racial distinctions, but because they were evolved from people having a different family or organisation and mode of life. Even at home the Anglo-Saxon cannot profess to be in entire sympathy with the Celt, or to have successfully coped with the mutual political problems. How much more difficult, then, is it for us to deal sympathetically and wisely with savage or barbaric peoples? Many of our executive officers recognise but one way, and that is our traditional English method. If we take upon ourselves the regulation of half the universe, we should at least see that we do no injustice. Our aim should rather be to develop the native institutions in as natural a manner as possible, and not to attempt to make the people conform to our usages—in fact, to try to make them Anglo-Saxons. The task is an impossible one, even if it were possible it would be highly undesirable. One certain result of the effort is the degrading or extermination of the natives. Taking the lowest possible view, what is the use of exterminating the native population of a place that Europeans—or at all events the British—can never permanently colonise? It may be replied that we have no desire to exterminate native populations. Theoretically we may not; but I would remind you of that fearful page on the list of the history of our colonies, the extermination of the Tasmanians. It would be a useful lesson to read the history of our dealings with other savage peoples from our professedly Christian standpoint, and at the same time supposing it to be the record of some other colonising nation. It would not do to take only the recognised or official histories, but to study the question from the native's point of view, and of his relations, not with a responsible Government, but with the pioneers, the beach-combers, the lawless traders, the adventurers. The troubles we have with native populations are largely—mind, I do not say entirely—the result of the actions of irresponsible

whites. What the natives have suffered at times from such people is heart-rending, and they would be less than men if they did not rebel. This they can do only in their own way, and too often they fling themselves in their blind, unthinking fury, against the majesty of our law—with but one result. It may also be urged that these are old stories. Granted that some are, but it is their effects that we are reaping. It is not so long since Lumholtz wrote about the relations between the whites and the Queensland blacks. Nor is it long since what was euphoniously termed "black-birding" became illegal in the West Pacific. I, for one, firmly believe that what has happened may be repeated in the immediate future unless great care and vigilance are enforced.

The practical result of this discussion he hoped would be the establishment in England of a Bureau of the Ethnography of native races in the British Colonies. The Imperial Institute was more a colonial club and museum of economics than anything else. It was established to show how the most could be made out of the colonies. What was wanted was an institution which would have the responsibilities as well as the emoluments of power—[a voice: "Oh, oh"]—an institution which would take into its purview the actual conditions of native races, and where information could be given to members of Parliament and others concerning the various peoples in the colonies.

The PRESIDENT said the suggestion made by the last speaker with regard to the extension of systematic knowledge of native races was a most important one.

Dr. R. N. CUST, Hon. Sec. to the Royal Asiatic Society, then read the following Protest against the unnecessary uprooting of ancient civilization in Asia and North Africa.

There is a tendency on the part of the Anglo-Saxon to depreciate the social customs of other Nations, more especially of those who are on a different level of culture, such as the people of Asia and North Africa. I purposely exclude from my argument all races admittedly in a state of barbarism, and my remarks have no reference to the attempts of Missionary Associations to convert the souls of non-Christian races.

Those who survey the whole world from the point of view of an Ethnologist and Sociologist, cannot but be aware that it is not only in the colour of the skin—white, yellow, brown, red, and black—and the character of the hair, that one race differs by a law of Nature from another, but there is a great cleavage in social customs, such as the fashion of dress, the forms of speech and writing, the unwritten laws of politeness, the character of food eaten, and the mode of eating it, the manner of disposing of the dead, the popular prejudices, and many other human details.

There is however a general approximation and closer contact of the nations of the round world in progress; no one wishes to retard it. There is a general softening of manners and removal of prejudices.

There are Races and Races. It may be possible, that some are not so pleasant to consort with as could be wished, but it must be emphatically stated, that as regards the majority of our fellow-subjects in British India, it is possible to form acquaintances and friendships, based on a mutual respect, and to associate with them on the same terms as with one's own countrymen, notwithstanding that they differ from us in religion, language, dress, social customs, prejudices, names, mode of address, &c.

My protest is against the attempt to uproot the ancient Oriental civilization of races which come under the influence of European Powers, and to destroy their ancestral customs and manners of social life in all matters, which are not contrary to the principles of moral law.

It has been sternly laid down in judicial decisions in British India, that nothing can be theologically right which is morally wrong. If Jephthah had carried out his rash vow at Lahore I should have hung Jephthah.

I read a paper lately to a Young Men's Christian Association in London, "On the attitude which a missionary should occupy to a non-Christian people, as regards their religion, their custom, and their prejudices." I enforced the duty to do Christian things in a Christian way.

I wish to carry this principle further, and to apply it to all visitors, sojourners, and officials, of European origin and culture, who are connected with those coloured races of Asia and North Africa, which are not barbarian. Other speakers will treat on this occasion with the barbarian races.

Are we sure that the social customs of Europe and the United States of North America, are in themselves abstractly the best? At any rate they differ very much from each other. It would not be difficult to distinguish a native of India, who had been "Portuguesed," from one who had been "Anglicised" in his externals; both would be objects of derision. Why do we meet the title "Mr." placed before the name of a respectable Hindu or Mahometan of Ancient lineage? Why are the female members of his family called "ladies"? Why in a French Colony are all the residents compelled to learn French, and in British India is the study of English indirectly forced upon the educated youth of the country notwithstanding that they have magnificent vernaculars, older than, and as polished as, English, the outcome of a language, dead and disused except by scholars, which is equal to, or superior to, Greek and Latin? How pitiful does an Indian appear in European garments, whose bearing is graceful and dignified in those of his own country! I might pass under review other features of social life, but my opinion is decided, that the best policy is to leave them alone in all things lawful, and allow the features of their life to develop according to their own standards, and not to attempt to convert a high class Indian gentleman into a Briton of the middle classes.

An educated native of India, when he receives his oral instructions as an official in a Court, renders the rough, and often ungrammatical sentences of the European judge or magistrate, into an accurate, faithful, and strictly legal form of words, to make up the record of the case; if called upon to write a letter on public or private affairs in any of the languages of India, he will do it with extreme elegance, and suitability to the rank of the party writing and the party written to; there is a recognised style of correspondence which is followed. Now ask the native clerk trained in the English schools to write an English

letter, and he will produce a strange bombastic, Johnsonian document, painful to read, and causing the training, which could lead to such a production, to be despised. Scores of such letters are handed about as the specimens of the new culture of the Anglicised Indian, to be laughed at.

Another party wishes to reform the Marriage Laws, or the Dietary, of a Nation of nearly 300 millions, because they do not conform to the custom of the English middle classes. In the East, marriage takes place at an extremely early age, and the boys and girls, as we should describe them, are parents. If this practice were destructive of life, we should not have a population increasing at the rate of three millions per annum. Those who have lived among the people of India in their hundreds of market-towns and thousands of villages, can testify to the absence of outwardly visible signs of suffering, which are obvious to the traveller in North Africa from Egypt to Marocco. There are no Divorce Courts in India except for the convenience of the Europeans.

Why not leave the subject of matrimony to gradual modification under the influence of education, both male and female, civilization of an indigenous character, and individual freedom?

So as regards the articles of consumption by way of food and drink; what possible advantage can come from an association composed of male and female residents in a different country, attempting to control a vast Oriental population, crying out, "You must not eat, or smoke opium; you must not drink alcohol, &c."? This advice is more painfully ridiculous, as the people of India know that the English are the most drunken race of the world, while the majority of themselves by habit, poverty, and religion, are total abstainers.

Polygamy and polyandry are distasteful subjects, and yet the former recalls the names of King David and King Solomon. The practice of polygamy, though legal both to Hindu and Mahometan, is dying out. The Government of India tolerates no customs contrary to morality, such as the burning of widows, the slaughter of female children, the burying alive of lepers, the exporting of persons to be slaves; any form of

injury to life whether under religious sanction, or purely secular, is sternly repressed. There are no eunuchs recorded in the last census; the class has ceased to exist, as the process is punishable by criminal law.

My references are chiefly to India, because thence I can produce facts, as an eye witness, and possessing considerable experience. The principles of the Indian Government are essentially conservative in the best sense, and sympathetic, going to the extreme limit of religious tolerance, such as the world has never witnessed before; so as regards the legal consequences of marriage and inheritance, the old laws of the country are maintained; no attempt is made to introduce Roman law or English law, unless on subjects not provided for by Indian law; but the asperity of patriarchal law is checked; no wife is made over to her husband against her will; the status of the female is elevated to equality with the male.

The social culture of each nation or tribe grows and develops by its own laws, and just as the language of each nation defies the ukases of sovereigns or the Acts of Parliament, so culture forms itself on its own pattern, borrowing at its own discretion from its neighbours. Any attempt to uproot an ancient culture is futile, as well as foolish.

It may be corrupted, as the civilization of Equatorial West Africa is being corrupted, by contact with Europeans, and the import of liquors, gunpowder, and lethal weapons; it may be improved gradually and insensibly, by the silent influence of male and female education in their own language, and the repression of violence and disorder by stern impartial laws, as is the case in British India. The culture which will be developed there in the 20th century will be an interesting study to the anthropologist—the general softening of manners of a people already ready to be gracious in their manners; a sense of the absence of lawlessness, and the presence of personal liberty; a realm of law; no licence allowed to intolerant teachers of new religious conceptions, but an opportunity of studying new principles, peacefully brought before the intelligence, and home to the heart of the people; no

licence to ridiculous fadmongers; free and easy contact with distant provinces; no permission to foreigners to insult by word, or printed matter, or pictures, the antient customs and religious conviction of a great nation.

An amount of forbearance to customs, which to European eyes seem ridiculous, is required, and should be enforced on foreigners who introduce themselves into any country, the natives of which never invited them. If foreigners were to introduce themselves into England, and Arab Mahometans were to get possession of a plot of ground close to Westminster Abbey, erect a conspicuous mosque with minarets, and call to prayer in loud tones, I doubt whether the populace of Loudon would bear it. They would at first treat it contemptuously as a nuisance, and the police would deal with it in the category of dustmen, fruitsellers, and milkman's cries, or a street-band of nigger singers and music; but there would be a limit to patience.

But what can be said of Englishmen who presumably enter China on a Christian Mission, erecting on a sacred hill in Fuchau a lofty building, which overhung the place of Chinese worship? The Chinese have a custom called "Fung Shu," which considers the falling of the shadow of another building on a sacred place as desecration. If the Chinese from time to time rise up against the "Foreign Devils" and take their revenge in an atrocious manner, this is the real cause: that they do not want the presence of overbearing and unsympathising foreigners in their midst.

In British India Europeans are compelled by equal laws to conduct themselves with restraint, and to their honour it may be said that they do so. Thirty years ago however an American erected a chapel on the edge of a Sacred Tank in Northern India for the convenience of addressing the Hindu devotees while bathing. It was a gross outrage. Let us imagine a body of Mormonites, or Theosophists, erecting a preaching-shop just outside the doors of Westminster Abbey. I took Lord Canning, the Viceroy, down to see it, and by his orders had it **razed** to the ground.

Now it is possible, though not probable, that a compound Indo-European language may come into existence by the same process, that produced the great Urdu Lingua-Franca or "camp" language of the Turki and Persian invaders of India. Yet care is taken by the Government of British India, that administration and education in all its departments is carried out in the vernacular of each province; they are noble forms of speech and as numerous as the languages of Europe; one at least is spoken by 80 millions. No encouragement is given to change of the native dress of the officials; they are expected to uncover their feet, and cover their heads in the presence of their superiors. This marks a great principle.

The conclusion I have come to after fifty years of experience, wide reading, and careful consideration is summed up in the few words:—"Leave the people of Oriental countries alone." Maintain a firm, impartial criminal and civil court of justice, with no prejudice against, or favour for, the black, white, red, or yellow skin; free locomotion, free right of assembly, free religion, free trade, free press (subject to the same limitation as in England), opposition to old women's fads, and the gushy suggestions of impertinent intruders into the domestic habits of a nation many centuries older, and very much more numerous, than our own. Customs and the salient features of civilization will gradually modify. Respect for human life, and respect for rights of property and the liberty of the person, create a social environment totally unknown before: we do not want the great races of India, and China, and the extreme Orient, or the barbarian races of Africa, south of the Equator to be trimmed to the model—intellectual and social—of the middle classes of England. They are free from some of the vices of British civilization, and possess some virtues which we fail to attain; although they have compensating vices of their own, the result of ignorance, oppression, and isolation from contact with other nations. Leave them alone to tread their own path, and develop their own social idiosyncracies under a realm of impartial and absolute law.

Dr. FORBES said the Dutch exercised authority over millions of people in the East, and he felt bound to say, after an experience of a great

many years, that their administration and government of subject races appeared to be most successful. Within the period of Dutch occupation the population had enormously increased, and there were now something like 1,000 people to the square mile. The officials and colonists had taken the wise step of learning the native language, and did not require the natives to acquire the Dutch language. The people lived in the most perfect happiness and were very well off. The best method of dealing with the Papuans was to leave them alone and set up a very high standard for them to follow. In regard to missionary work, the actual religious change which takes place upon the native was extremely small. This was not to be wondered at—indeed, the marvel was that such a highly philosophical system of religion as the Christian was comprehended by savages at all. It was worthy of note that uncivilized people seemed to imagine when they became “praying men” that they had a right to do what they liked, and became in many cases a great deal worse than those who did not profess Christianity. Such men as Lawes and Chalmers had, however, done enormous good in New Guinea, their method of working being that while they prevented “head-hunting” and murders, they otherwise left the natives to their own civilization. In no country had he seen more perfect morality than in New Guinea, although the men went about entirely naked and the women very slightly attired. While the Dutch was better than the British system of dealing with subject races, the British was superior to the German system of colonization. The Germans did not appear to know how to colonize—this was probably due to the military spirit with which they were imbued.

Mr. E. F. IM-THURN spoke on the red men of Guiana. In his opinion, the enormous mistake which was made in dealing with what were known as savage races was in trying to teach them civilised morality all at once. In one instance a savage tribe in Guiana, as the result of a fortnight's teaching, were baptised, and they then abandoned their hunting and erected a church, but instead of a religious painting such as the one in the building they were imitating, they put up a portrait of Mr. Gladstone from the *Illustrated London News*. [Laughter.] The priests gabbled away as they had seen the missionaries do, and, relieving each other by turns, talked, not only all

day, but all night. [Laughter.] This went on for a fortnight, the people continually calling out the word "Hallelujah." [Laughter.] Ultimately, as no work was done, the tribe was brought to the verge of starvation, and in the end they put to death the elder whom they had elected as high priest, and returned to their ancient rites. No doubt the killing of the priest was very wrong, but he (the speaker) was not very sorry to hear of it, or that the tribe had rid themselves of an encumbrance which they could not bear. The future of the Guiana races was very dark. He trusted there would be a missionary found who would go amongst this people and show them absolute justice and sympathy, while at the same time being content to leave the teaching of Christianity until the next generation, or may be the succeeding one. In dealing with savage races sympathy and justice should always be kept in the foreground.

The PRESIDENT said it was to be hoped that the despondency which characterised the remarks of the last speaker would have the effect of urging people to a careful consideration of the questions touched upon in this discussion.

Mr. DARNELL DAVIS said the tribes of British Guiana were treated in a considerate manner by the Government. They were exempted from the payment of licence fees for guns and canoes, and otherwise were generally treated well. Englishmen who had not been abroad did not seem to recognise the immense responsibilities which the control of over 300,000,000 of people entailed. By the administration of right and justice the Empire was held together, and he was glad to know that the Governors of all British possessions had to take an oath that they would do right and justice to all men. [Hear, hear.] What was more, these gentlemen invariably acted up to the terms of their oath. [Hear, hear.]

Mr. LING-ROTH said it was supposed sometimes that the extermination of native races was a thing of the past, but, as a matter of fact, what was very nearly the same thing was going on in the Australian colonies to-day. The Local Governments sold lands which did not belong to them, to white men. These killed the game which eat the grass, and the natives being deprived of their food speared the cattle and

sheep placed on the pastures; thus there was antagonism between the races, and there could be no doubt as to which was getting the worst of the fight. Missionary efforts amongst the Aborigines were not very successful, and the wearing of clothes seemed to induce the spread of consumption. There seemed to be absolutely no hope for the Aboriginal of Australia, which was much to be regretted, especially on account of the wonderful classification of families, which Mr. Howitt had only discovered recently. Passing from Australia he might state that at Sarawak head-hunting expeditions were prevented, but in every other way the natives were left to themselves. This had a most satisfactory effect.

Mr. RAYNBIRD, who has lived for many years in Central India, said he was an educated European and had lived in the closest connection with the savage races of Central India for the fixed purpose of understanding those races. In studying those savages they would find them imitative and reflective, and if they wanted to reclaim them it was necessary to give them an occupation—not an occupation of an intellectual nature, but of an industrial nature. In dealing with native races he was strongly of opinion that a member of any particular race should never be placed in an authoritative position over another race. He was sorry to say the Government appointed officers of certain races to positions of authority over other races, and the result was they had insurrection after insurrection. Europeans' ideas of justice in regard to the land were based on the feudal or family system. The idea of the savage as to the ownership of land was that the man who first cleared the forest became possessor of that land. He was confident if officials only bore that in mind it would relieve them of a great deal of the trouble that had taken place in regard to the land question. Sympathy went a long way in influencing the natives, and the Pigmy of the Forest would recognise and render homage to the perfect gentleman.

The PRESIDENT then summed up the discussion. He said that there was a variation in the extent of Government interference that might be desirable, according to the varying degree of civilization. In highly-organised communities, with a culture as complex as, or more so, than our own, no interference appeared desirable, beyond the barest minimum of protecting life and property. In

lower races it might be needful to have a more paternal government to protect them against the bad influences of our civilization to which they were not yet inured; thus securing them against the loss of their property by debt and sales of land. The same principle applies to the use of drink and narcotics; where a race is already inured to such stimulants, only the growth of moral sense must be our resort, as the people already realize the evils that are involved. But where a race has had no experience, and has no self-control, it is needful to rigorously prohibit alcohol, tobacco, opium, &c. The varying nature of the laws required in different conditions appeared from the benefit of the vendetta in Guiana, an institution also common among the Israelites, but quite unsuited to a different level of life. Above all, it appeared that impartiality was not attained by equal laws if the circumstances were unequal; the same law might be fair to a European, but against all sense of justice to a native. We need to understand the native's sense of justice, and of right and wrong, before we can treat him justly. Among children we know that the sense of justice is the keenest feeling, and it is so with lower races. No greater injury or insult can be given to a child than to violate its sense of justice, and the same is true of all men, down to the least civilized. As to native customs, there is a general agreement that in every case where they do not destroy life they had much better be left as unaltered as possible. If they are unsuited to changed conditions, they also will change as may be needful, little by little. The same is true of the native morality. Every race has its own system of morals, deviation from which is severely punished; and this system is found to work in the original life of the people. When a different kind of life is introduced by fresh influences, the moral code will gradually alter. But to set up a new code independent of the circumstances of life may do the greatest injury. A conscientious and scrupulous polygamist or polyandrist is a far better man than an immoral European; and if we impose our code upon people, we run the greatest risk of destroying their conscience by bringing in also the immorality and hypocrisies which too generally accompany that code. The same principles apply to dress. We have had a pleasing witness from more than one speaker that the moral sense is independent of dress. Among people who wear

little or no dress we hear that the regard for decency and morality is quite as great, or greater, than it is among clothed races. Dress is purely a question of what is familiar. We make no scruple in exposing the faces of women in Mahomedan countries, and ignore the scruples of the faithful. We deliberately do what is more indecent in their eyes than the exposure of all the rest of the body. Why, then, should we profess to be shocked if other races prefer to continue with as little clothing as they wish? If this were merely a matter of taste we might at least respect the taste and freedom of other peoples. But it is far more, it is a vital question of health. As we have been reminded, to clothe the skin is to deprive it largely of its functions for health, to throw more strain on the internal organs than they are able to bear, and to directly cause consumption and kidney disease. How far these diseases, which are the direct accompaniment of undue clothing in other races, owe their prevalence amongst us to the same cause, is a matter for serious consideration. At least we must remember that any extensive clothing of the body involves serious changes in the constitution which cannot be made in a lifetime. The same is true of living in closed rooms with vitiated air. To take men accustomed to healthy action of the body, always in open air, as among the jungle tribes, and to clothe them and make them live in rooms, is as cruel as it would be to turn out the members of this Association naked into the jungle to pick up their living. Above all, every speaker has dwelt on the need of sympathy and understanding the point of view of other peoples. To do any real good we must see with their eyes, and think in their thoughts, and in proportion as we encourage the natural growth of all that is good and worthy in the native systems, and learn to look at all questions as an intelligent native, in that proportion shall we have real influence for good, which will last and be the beginning of new life.

PRINTED AT THE
" EAST ANGLIAN DAILY TIMES " PRINTING WORK
CARR STREET, IPSWICH.

